

399.

- II. Claims 4-10, drawn to promoting cell growth using folliculo stellate-derived growth factor, classified in class 424, subclass 198.1.
- III. Claims 12, 13, 17, 26-28, 33, 38-39, drawn to methods of purification of folliculo stellate-derived growth factor protein, classified in class 530, subclass 412.
- IV. Claims 41-44, drawn to recombinant production of folliculo stellate-derived growth factor, classified in class 435, subclass 69.1.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP §§ 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product may be used for the production of antibodies.

Inventions I and III are related as process of purifying and product purified. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP §§ 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product may be isolated via immunoaffinity purification.

Inventions I and IV are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP §§ 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product may be isolated from its natural source.

The methods of Inventions II-IV are separate and distinct, wherein each has different starting and ending points, involves different method steps, and uses or produces distinct products or results. Accordingly, each requires separate search, and restriction is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently